



Regional Workshop #3 Summary

Project: South Davis County Transit DEIS

Date/Time: Wednesday, September 26, 2007; 11:00 A.M. – 1:30 P.M.

Subject: Overview of Long List of Alignments & Alignment Evaluation Exercise.

Location: South Davis Recreation Center

Attendees

Utah Transit Authority	Kerry Doane
Utah Department of Transportation	Angelo Papastamos Andy Neff Rex Harris
Carter & Burgess	Colleen Lavery Bill Lieberman
H. W. Lochner	Saffron Capson Ross Peterson Ashley Mason
V-I-A Consulting	Kim Clark
Fehr & Peers	Robin Hutcheson Jonathan Larsen Jon Nepstad Kyle Cook
UBET	Roger Borgenicht
Davis County	Scott A. Hess
Bountiful	Dorothy Barlow Aric Jensen Tom Smith Lynne Bennett
Centerville	Tamilyn Fillmore Steve Thacker Sherri Lindstrom Phil Sessions Cory Snyder
Farmington	Scott Ogilvie Jared Hall Sid Young
North Salt Lake	Conrad Jacobson Blaine Gehring
Salt Lake City	Dorothy Barlow Kevin Young
West Bountiful	Wendell Wild David Tovey Alan Malan



Woods Cross	Tim Stephens David Jelmini Anne Blankenship Charlie Payne Ruth Payne
-------------	--

Notes

The notes contained within this document provide a summary of the content discussed during the meeting on the given date and time stated above. If this content differs from your understanding, please notify Jacqueline Jensen of any discrepancies within five working days.

Summary of the Regional Workshop

(1) Welcome/Overview of Regional Meetings

- Upon entering the Regional Workshop, each attendee was given a nametag; a meeting agenda and a “community support” matrix. Attendees were asked to sit with individuals from other cities rather than from their own.
- K. Clark reviewed the meeting agenda and project process diagram. She explained the meeting was the third Regional Workshop for this project.

(2) Review of Purpose statement

- K. Clark used a presentation board to discuss the overall purpose of the project. She encouraged meeting attendees to keep the overall purpose of the project in mind as they consider the long list of alternatives developed for the project.

(3) Review of Sub-Committee and Web Site Findings

- During the most recent round of sub-committee meetings attendees were asked to identify the most important “factors to consider” when discussing alternative modes for a transit project. The findings from these meetings were presented at the regional workshop. K. Clark noted the highest ranking factor was “I need to be able to get to it easily.” A pie chart displaying these results was also shown.
- An online comment form has been available since the last round of sub-committee meetings to gain input on this topic from the general public. The findings from the online comment form were also presented in both table and pie chart format. Similarly the highest ranking factor was “I need to be able to get to it easily.”

(4) Alternatives

- K. Clark explained an alternative is developed by combining a mode and alignment.
- The long list of alternatives map was shown. It was explained these alternatives are being taken through the alternatives analysis process.
- In addition to the north south alignments a background bus network has been created. The background bus network is being used to assist in the modeling of the primary alternatives. It will possibly change in the future. The background bus network was shown on presentation boards at the regional workshop.
- K. Clark described the long list of alignments and the modes associated with each alignment. She explained there is the potential for some of the modes to either share their alignment with traffic or be located in their own exclusive lane. The trade-offs of exclusive / shared lanes were presented. Illustrations of shared and exclusive lanes were shown.

(5) Alternative Evaluation

- The overall evaluation criteria for the project were presented to the meeting attendees. K. Clark explained ridership, travel time and cost for each of the alternatives was currently being evaluated.
- Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide input on environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts and positive land-use effects during the alignment evaluation exercise by writing on the maps provided.
- Community support for the alternatives would be provided by meeting attendees completing the “community support” matrix provided.

(6) Exercise

- Meetings were split into groups of approximately six people. A member of the project team facilitated each group discussion. Each group was provided with a copy of each of the five alternative maps showing typical cross sections for different modes. Each group was also provided with a summary of the pros and cons of each mode identified at the recent sub-committee meetings and via the online comment forms.
- During lunch attendees were asked to complete the “community support” matrix. Alignments were evaluated by determining whether they would accomplish the purpose of the project. Each alignment was given an overall rating from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Each group then provided a group overall rating for each of the alignments (the findings of the exercise are shown below).

(7) Mode Preferences

- Sub-committee meeting attendees and respondents to the online comment form were asked to indicate their preferred mode choice. Findings were shown at the end of the Regional Workshop.

(8) Next Steps

- An Open House Meeting is planned for early November.

Table 1:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	3	3	1	2	1
	4	5	2	4	2
	3	4	4	5	3
	5	5	3	3	3
	4	5	3	4	2
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	1	4	3	4	4
	4	2	5	4	4
	5	4	5	5	5
	4	5	5	5	5
	5	5	3	4	3
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	1	2	1	2	1
	3	2	1	3	1
	3	4	3	5	1
	2	4	2	4	1
	3	5	2	3	1
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	5	2	2	1	2
	4	4	4	4	4
	3	3	3	3	1
	4	4	4	4	3
	5	5	3	4	2
Allow for integration of land use plans?	2	3	4	5	5
	3	3	4	4	5
	3	3	3	3	2
	4	4	4	3	1
	5	4	2	3	1
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	3	4	3	4	3
	4	4	4	4	4
	3	3	3	3	2
	3	4	3	4	1
	4	5	2	3	2
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	4	4	1	1	1
	4	4	4	4	5
	3	3	3	3	2
	4	3	3	4	4
	5	3	3	3	2
Fit the context of the community?	3	3	3	1	5
	2	5	2	2	2
	3	2	3	4	5
	5	4	4	3	4
	5	5	2	3	1
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	3	4	2	3	2
	4	5	3	5	4
	4	5	2	3	1
	4+	5	4-	5	4
	5	4	2	3	1
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	4	4+	3	3+	2
Comments	Fits into community, frequent stops. Safety in the public eye, centralized location, access, local and commuter service.	Alignment change suggestion (for premium service): west on Pages to Main Street in West Bountiful, west on 500 South, south on Redwood. Bus/BRT – Redwood is a logical future tie-in.	N/A	Alignment change suggestion: see above. Consider road width. Better for limited stop service.	Stop below Parrish is a potential congestion concern. Access is difficult.

		Versatile, ability to expand branches, frequent stops, fits into community.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

*No room on Main in Centerville (Pages to Parrish).

Table 2:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	3 1 1 3	5 2 2 5	2 5 5 3	4 4 4 4	1 3 3 1
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	4 4 1 3	2 5 2 5	3 3 3 3	1 2 5 4	5 1 1 3
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	3 1 3 2	5 2 2 3	2 3 4 2	4 4 5 3	1 5 1 1
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	5 4 3 3	3 3 2 3	4 5 4 3	2 2 5 3	1 1 1 1
Allow for integration of land use plans?	4 1 1 2	2 3 2 3	3 4 4 2	1 5 5 3	5 2 3 1
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	3 1 4 2	5 4 3 4	2 5 2 2	4 3 1 4	1 2 5 3
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	4 3 3 3	2 2 4 3	3 4 5 3	1 5 2 3	5 1 1 1
Fit the context of the community?	5 2 4 2	3 5 3 4	4 5 5 2	2 4 2 4	1 1 1 1
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	5 4 1 3	3 2 2 3	4 5 5 4	2 3 4 4	1 1 3 1
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	2	2	5	5	1
Comments	Minimizes transfers, utilizes Intermodal hub. Can bus alignment connect into rail options? At termination in Salt Lake City, does the rider have to transfer to the Intermodal Hub?	N/A	Alignment change suggestion: Continue along 500 West rather than diverting to 400 West on Pages. Using 400 West limits speed and adds to congestion. More ROW available on 800 West in North Salt Lake. Prefer exclusive lane for this alignment. Alignment benefits from Highway 89 being widened.	N/A	Would residents use it? Increased east-west congestion. East-side access.

Table 3:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	2	5	3	4	5
	5	5	1	2	1
	3	2	4	3	5
	1	2	5	3	5
	3	4	2	3	2
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	3	3	4	4	5
	5	5	4	4	4
	4	3	4	3	5
	4	4	5	4	5
	4	4	4	4	4
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	2	5	2	4	2
	3	4	1	2	1
	2	5	1	4	1
	5	5	4	4	3
	3	5	3	5	2
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	3	5	3	3	4
	5	5	2	2	1
	3	4	2	4	2
	2	3	5	3	5
	3	4	3	4	3
Allow for integration of land use plans?	3	2	4	3	5
	5	4	1	1	1
	4	4	1	2	1
	5	4	5	4	5
	4	4	2	2	2
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	3	4	3	4	4
	5	5	1	2	2
	3	4	3	4	2
	2	3	5	3	5
	3	4	2	3	3
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	3	4	3	2	4
	5	4	1	2	1
	4	3	3	2	2
	2	3	5	3	5
	3	4	1	1	3
Fit the context of the community?	4	5	1	4	2
	5	5	1	2	1
	3	4	4	5	5
	5	3	5	3	5
	4	4	3	3	3
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	2	5	1	3	4
	5	4	1	2	1
	3	2	4	3	4
	2	3	5	3	5
	4	5	3	3	2
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	4	3	3*	2	2
Comments	Farmington residents are concerned about ROW.				
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*One group member voted "1".

Table 4:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	3	4	3	3	2
	4	5	3	3	2
	2	-	-	2	5
	5	5	3	4	2
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	4	4	4	2	1
	4	5	3	3	3
	3	-	-	-	4
	5	4	5	4	5
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	4	5	4	4	3
	4	5	2	3	1
	1	-	-	-	-
	2	4	1	3	1
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	3	2	3	3	5
	4	5	2	3	2
	-	4	-	-	-
	5	3	3	4	2
Allow for integration of land use plans?	2	2	2	1	1
	5	4	3	3	1
	-	-	-	4	-
	5	2	2	2	2
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	4	3	4	2	1
	3	3	4	4	2
	-	-	-	4	-
	5	5	3	3	2
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	5	4	5	2	4
	4	5	2	3	1
	5	5	3	4	4
	5	4	3	4	4
Fit the context of the community?	4	3	4	2	1
	5	4	2	3	1
	-	-	-	-	-
	5	5	3	4	2
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	4	2	4	3	2
	4	4	2	3	1
	1	5	2	3	4
	5	4/3	3	3	2
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	3.5	4	3	3	2
Comments	<p>Is there a need for a dedicated lane? Getting a dedicated lane on Parrish would encroach on residential neighborhood. Along Parrish to Pages, check if you can get a reserved lane.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>				

*Exclusive lanes as much as practical, but probably not feasible north of Parrish Lane.

Table 5:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	2 - 2 1 4	5 - 3 1 5	3 3 - 5 1	4 - - 5 2	2 1 - 5 0
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	3 5 3 1 5	5 - 3 1 5	3 5 - 5 4	3 - - 5 4	3 - - 5 0
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	2 - 2 1 3	5 - 5 1 5	1 - - 5 1	5 - - 5 5	1 1 - 5 0
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	2 - 3 1 5	4 - 4 1 5	2 - - 5 2	4 - - 5 3	2 1 - 5 0
Allow for integration of land use plans?	3 - 2 1 3	3 - 3 1 4	3 - - 5 1	3 - - 5 3	3 - - 5 2
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	1 - 2 1 4	5 - 4 1 5	2 - - 5 2	5 - - 5 3	2 - - 5 0
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	4 - 2 1 5	5 - 4 1 5	2 - - 5 2	5 - - 5 2	5 1 - 5 0
Fit the context of the community?	5 - 4 1 5	5 - 4 1 5	3 - - 5 2	5 - - 5 2	5 - - 5 0
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	2 4 3 1 5	5 4 4 1 5	3 2 3 5 1	5 3 4 5 2	3 1 5 (if branches are added) 5 0
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	3.5	4	2.8	3	2.75
Comments	Get exact ROW width between Parrish and	N/A	The alignment isn't reaching people between Lund and	N/A	The more closely aligned with the freeway, the more



	Pages. Alignment changes suggestion: Orchard		Parrish. 500 West isn't a TOD.		likely residents will be to drive. Too far away from residents.
--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

*A lot of disparity among group members. Branches are great, but the reliability and speed on the trunk is essential if ridership is important.
 *One group member noted the Main Street alignment address environmental concerns, is faster, and is more reliable. The Main Street Trunk w/ Branches picks up more riders, is more flexible with space, and is more cost effective.

Table 6:

	Main Street	Main Street w/ Branches	Frontage Road	Frontage Road w/ Branches	Commuter Rail Line
Increase mobility within the area?	4 3 1 5	5 3 1 5	3 4 5 5	5 4 5 5	3 4 2 2
Connect to transportation options outside Davis County?	4 4 1 5	4 4 1 5	3 4 5 5	4 3 5 5	3 4 2 3
Improve east/west connectivity in the region?	1 3 0 3	5 3 0 5	1 4 4 3	5 4 4 5	1 2 1 2
Reduce auto use by providing transit options?	4 4 1 2	5 4 1 3	4 3 5 2	5 4 5 3	3 3 2 1
Allow for integration of land use plans?	3 2 0 4	5 2 0 4	3 2 5 3	5 3 5 4	3 3 3 2
Allow for coordination of auxiliary services (i.e. other modes of transportation, locations for stops)?	3 2 1 5	3 2 1 5	3 3 5 4	3 3 5 4	3 3 3 2
Create a more attractive option to the passenger (i.e. does it feel safe, easy to access, etc.)?	3 3 0 5	3 3 0 3	3 3 4 4	3 3 4 3	3 3 4 1
Fit the context of the community?	3 2 0 1	3 2 0 3	4 3 4 3	4 3 4 3	3 4 3 4
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	3 2 0 3	4 2 0 4	4 3 4 4	5 3 4 4+	3 3 2 2
Overall Rating (independent of the above options)	2	2.5	4	4	2
Comments	Farmington residents and Mayor expressed concern about an alignment on Main Street/200 East/SR 106.	Add a stop at Glover.	Bountiful feels 200 West may be better for an alignment (rather than 500 West)	N/A	N/A

*Potentially destroy character and too narrow ROW.

*One group member noted wanting to see shared lanes through downtowns in select areas, and exclusive lanes where traffic is moving faster.

Overall Alignment Evaluation / Community Support:

Main Street Trunk with Branches – Bus/BRT	20.5
Frontage Road Trunk with Branches – LRT	20.0
Frontage Road Trunk – Bus/BRT	19.8
Main Street Trunk – Various Modes	19.0
Commuter Rail Corridor – Various Modes	10.75

Next Meeting

Open House Meeting – Early November.